DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 172 PS 018 563

AUTHOR Laukkanen, Reijo
TITLE Dissemination of the Project's Findings. National Seminar (2nd, Heinola, Finland, April 11-15, 1988). The CDCC's Project No. 8: "Innovation in Primary Education."
INSTITUTION Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
REPORT NO DECS/EGT(88)47
PUB DATE 5 Sep 89
NOTE 22p.; For related documents, see PS 018 564-566.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Improvement; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; *Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; *State Programs; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Finland

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the work of a national seminar on the development of primary education. The aim of the meeting was to evaluate the final report of the Innovation in Primary Education Project, a project of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Cooperation. The evaluation placed particular emphasis on the process of deciding what areas of emphasis should be considered in the development of primary education in Finland. Contents of the report concern the international framework of the innovation project, the innovation project from a national point of view, and conclusions drawn from lectures, group evaluations of the final report, and general discussion. Conclusions focused on the innovation process, school research, teacher training, education and teaching, and use of the final report in Finland. The seminar program and a list of participants are appended. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315172

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

DECS/EGT (88) 47

Project No. 8 of the CDCC
"Innovation in primary education"

Dissemination of the project's findings

2nd National Seminar:
Finland - Heinola, 11-15 April 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Europe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 018363

Council for Cultural Co-operation
School Education Division

Strasbourg 1989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Strasbourg, 5 September 1989 DECS/EGT (88) 47
ADECSEGT47.88

The CDCC's Project No. 8
"Innovation in Primary Education"

DISSEMINATION OF THE PROJECT'S FINDINGS
2nd NATIONAL SEMINAR:

FINLAND

HEINOLA, 11-15 April 1988

Report written by Reijo LAUKKANEN,
Chief Inspector,
National Board of General Education,
Helsinki

The points of view expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION (CDCC)
School Education Division

Strasbourg 1989

18.459
04.2

Status of report

This report is a summary of the work carried out at the national seminar on the follow-up of the CDCC's Project No. 8 on "Innovation in Primary Education", held in Finland on 11-15 April 1988. The report is written by Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector at the Finnish National Board of General Education and leader of the seminar. The report gives the view and opinions expressed by the participants and does not necessarily mirror the views of the Finnish authorities on the issues that were debated.

The CDCC's project on innovation in primary education has been internationally important and beneficial both in regard to its working methods and its content. The importance of the project as an international forum of discussion is enhanced by the fact that not very many projects focusing primarily on primary education have so far been initiated. The realisation of the project in close co-operation with the authorities and schools of the nations involved has produced a very clear picture of the state of development and the objectives of primary education in the participating countries.

A new Comprehensive School Act came into force in Finland in 1985. The new legislation gives the municipalities who maintain the schools, and the teachers greater power of decision than heretofore in organising work at school and in selecting study content. Comprehensive school in Finland is a nine-year school of compulsory school attendance. Its six lower grades - for children of the ages of 7 to 12 - form the lower or primary education level of comprehensive school. Legislation gives ample power of decision, especially with regard to primary education, in organising instruction and in selecting subject matter. This has produced numerous local development projects. At the same time, the need for information on the various projects and the results achieved has increased. In order to pass on this information the National Board has set up a special primary education development project. The stimuli provided by the CDCC Innovation in Primary Education project have thus been most beneficial to Finland.

Course of seminar

In order to make full use of the results of the Innovation in Primary Education Project, the National Board of General Education, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, organised a seminar on the development of primary education. The seminar was held in Heinola on 11-15 April 1988. The planning of the seminar was done in co-operation with the secretariat of the CDCC.

The aim was to evaluate the final report of the project from the viewpoint of deciding in particular what areas of emphasis should be taken into consideration in developing primary education in Finland. At the same time, the aim was to provide general stimuli for the development of primary education through detailed scrutiny of educational problems met with in other European countries. A total of 45 people took part in the seminar. All our teacher training colleges, university practice schools and county governor's offices were invited to send their participants. There were also representatives of the Ministry of Education, the National Board of General Education, the Finnish Union of Local Authorities and Teachers' Trade Union. The municipalities that had participated in the project were, of course, also represented.

Programme and working method

The programme of the seminar is enclosed. The first two days of the seminar had been devoted to a general survey of the project. The language of the seminar was English, but discussions were held in Finnish/English with the aid of interpreters. The seminar benefited greatly by the fact that Mr Maitland Stobart, Deputy Director of Education, Culture and Sport of the Council of Europe was present on both days and delivered two lectures. On the second day of the seminar the work of the Contact School Plan was presented and analysed. The programme for the day had been planned by Dr. Dook Kopmels from the Netherlands, whose participation in the seminar had been made possible with the financial support of the CDCC. The lectures of both Mr Maitland Stobart and Dr. Dook Kopmels roused great interest and were greatly appreciated by the participants. The newspapers, covering the seminar, reported extensively on the lectures.

The remainder of the seminar was dedicated to the analysis of the final report. The language of the seminar was here Finnish. The analysis was preceded by opening speeches, reporting and emphasising issues discussed in the report that were of special interest to Finland. In addition to the final report, participants had been provided with copies of the Contact School Plan Report and other background material. Those delivering the opening speeches had been provided with more extensive background material, for example case study reports and the reports on the various symposiums and seminars that have been held on the Innovation in Primary Education Project. The aim was to give as detailed a picture of the issues in hand as possible. The greater part of the three last days of the seminar was spent in six working groups, whose findings were reported to the general assembly.

International framework of the innovation project

Mr Yrjö Yrjönsuuri, Deputy Director General at the National Board of General Education, made the opening address emphasising the importance of frankness in evaluating the final report on the Innovation in Primary Education Project. He also expressed his thanks to the CDCC for its support in organising the seminar.

Mr Yrjönsuuri reported about the general outline of the development work done so far, drawing attention to the fact that, in the face of the rapid internationalisation of Finnish society, it has become a matter of great importance to be able to develop primary education also by using international experience. When presenting trends in the light of current statistics, he pointed out that the situation in Finland in many respects, as yet, is another than in Europe at large. As an instance of this, he mentioned our numerous small schools, where the situation has more or less become standard. Many social and demographic traits in Finland, however, are less problematic than in many other countries. The power of decision and the freedom of the teachers in planning instruction had been increased. Many factors contribute to facilitate the development of primary education in Finland in the next few years.

Mr Jouko Könnölä, counsellor of education in the Ministry of Education, made a summary of the objectives, various arrangements and significance of Project No. 8 and the process in drawing up the final report. Of fundamental importance to the realisation of the project was the mapping out of the current situation of primary education in the participating countries and of reform projects and experimentation and research projects under way. Against this background, cultural and social factors were analysed. The need for the development of education was primarily scrutinised from the viewpoint of the overall development of the child and of instruction and learning. The fact that focus is on the child is one of the strong points of the project. An important angle of approach in the project was the utilisation of the new technology in developing education. Another important factor in the work done by the project was the examination of the existing possibilities for innovation and various strategies.

In terms of content, the various case studies proved most fruitful in giving progress reports on the project in hand. The views expressed by the teachers of the various contact schools proved very fertile. From the viewpoint of the fullness of the report and its general usefulness, it is one of fundamental importance that the final report combines the views of school management officials, researchers and teachers alike.

Mr Könnölä pointed out that the Finnish representatives in the course of the project have made the following observations:

- The trend in Europe is towards increasing interactive learning. This mode of emphasis is essential to individualisation but requires the renewal of classroom processes.

- In teaching, paying attention to the pupil's actual skills and knowledge, is being brought more and more to the fore. This can be seen not only in the introduction of new teaching methods, but also in the overall planning of teaching. Paying attention to the individual and emphasising the pupils' joint responsibility are clearly to be seen.

The principles governing development that have been put down in the final report support Finnish endeavours to co-ordinate instruction in primary education with the aid, for instance, of integrated teaching. The project also provides other broad-scale stimuli to the development of primary education.

Mr Maitland Stobart gave a presentation of the objectives, contents and working methods of educational co-operation activities within the Council of Europe. The interest of the various countries in international co-operation is based, among other things, on the fact that the great problems of today are no longer national, but to a large extent common to all the participating countries. Knowledge and research is a joint capital that should wisely be put to use.

In its work on education the CDCC seeks

- to bring new ideas, techniques and achievements discovered/perfected in one member state to the notice of all the countries.

- to increase contacts and co-operation among European educators

- to bring the peoples of Europe closer together and improve communication and understanding among Europeans.

Working methods have actively been developed in a way that activities could include the various parties involved in education. Activities should not be based wholly on collecting and evaluating written enquiries, but seek also to develop active working methods that can easily be implemented in the participating countries.

Mr Stobart put special emphasis on the importance of national measures in the utilisation of the work of the CDCC. The utility of the work, from the viewpoint of the individual countries, is dependent on to what extent and in what way the results of the project are made nationally known.

In the latter part of his lecture, Mr Maitland Stobart dealt with:

- the challenges of developing education

- challenge of work and non-work

- challenge of new technologies, including mass media

- challenge of education for life in a multicultural society

- challenge to democratic values.

Behind these challenges there are the continuous development of society and the uncertainty of the future. The background factors are economical, technological, political, social and cultural and they can be influenced mainly by means outside school itself. For this very reason, it must be emphasised that the expectations we put in our schools and educators must be reasonable. School should, however, make every effort, for its part, to increase its flexibility in responding to new needs.

Mr Stobart dealt extensively with the challenges enumerated above, giving numerous illustrations and connecting his presentation to the work done in the Council of Europe. By way of conclusion, Mr Stobart highlighted the challenges to teachers and their education.

Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector at the Finnish National Board of General Education, gave a presentation of the characteristics of the Schools for Primary Education in Europe especially from the standpoint of the structure and organisation of the educational system and the official aims of development. The presentation of the various systems and the plans for their renewal was based on the country reports submitted by the ministers of the participating states to the CDCC. The evaluation was made difficult by the report's lack of commensurability.

In bringing together the official aims concerning primary education expressed by the various countries, Mr Laukkanen drew attention to the fact that they were to a large extent very similar. This, of course, is evidence of our common European cultural inheritance. The objectives, however, do not necessarily mirror the

activity itself. The weighing of individual subjects and other activities in the weekly work of the school in the participating countries is difficult to evaluate accurately, because schedules are made up differently in the individual countries. The comparison of work schedules for primary schools in participating countries gave rise to a very lively debate among the participants to the seminar.

Differences in primary education between the participating countries were as follows

- amount of counselling on the national level
- organisation and maintenance of primary education
- educational system itself (length of compulsory school attendance, options in individual countries of organising primary education, length of the school week, school's work schedule, only to mention a few).

Despite the differences, the systems have numerous traits in common. Teaching routines and teachers' causes of worry are to a large extent very similar. So are the basic points of departure in fostering and education (emphasis on the same skills). The ideas for developing instruction are also very similar, for example the stressing of local subject matter, the promotion of integration between the various school subjects, the methods for evaluating work in school, the development of co-operation between the school and pupil's homes etc.

Mr Laukkanen also gave a summary of a report dealing with the expectations of post-primary education teachers in regard to primary education. The report in question stresses, among other things, the importance of achieving certain skills during primary education, the significance of pre-primary education in minimisation of learning difficulties arising from social and cultural factors and the necessity of interpreting the content and method of teaching and fostering as an inseparable whole.

Dr. Dook Kopmels, within the framework of the Contact School Plan, made a presentation of the report "School Improvement from Within" the highlights of which had been included in the final report on Innovation in Primary Education Project. He also gave a presentation of supportive measures employed by the schools, focusing in the main on the content and principles of activity employed at the Regional Pedagogic Centre of Zeeland.

Dr. Kopmels also gave an account of the content of innovation in each of the contact schools. The participants were greatly interested in the activity of the Dutch contact school, where the grouping of pupils had been realised in a way that diverges from the traditional grade as the basis of division. Due to the very large number of small schools in Finland, "family" grouping is very common. In Finland combined classes have been used differently from the Netherlands. It was generally considered that the described model in all probability gives attention to the individual development of the pupil.

Dr. Kopmels based his presentation on the innovation activities on the Five Zone Model. In regard to the Finnish school system, the following pedagogical areas of emphasis have gained importance:

- active individualisation. Activity in itself contains the notion of interactive learning. The implication is immediate interaction between the teacher and his pupil(s), an immediate evaluation of the progress made, the use of open-ended problems and questions, an emphasis on the scientific method and the learning of the strategies of problem solving;

- autonomy and co-operation. This means acceptance of the child. It is important that the child feels that he is an individual having his own thoughts, emotions and objectives. Out of this grows a respect also for other people's autonomy;

- new understanding of combined classes. The knowledge and skills of the pupil develop not only in accordance with the general abilities of his age group, but pupils may also be in different phases of development within their age group. In order to consider this as effectively as possible, the tradition of grouping pupils according to their age should be discontinued. In primary education the pupils should have the possibility of individual progress;

- continuous evaluation. What is meant here is interactive evaluation, in which both the pupil and the teacher participate. The evaluation should be individual, provided the principles of individualisation and autonomy are accepted and a new form of "family" grouping is introduced;

- effective management. This means, above all, interactive management.

In the final report, the main emphasis in guiding the innovational process is on the teacher's need of support and encouragement in his work. Activities at the Regional Pedagogic Centre of Zeeland give an interesting illustration of regional supportive measures.

The innovation project from a national point of view

Mr Jouko Könnölä gave an account of the provisions contained in the Finnish Comprehensive School Act for developing school curricula on the various levels of school administration. He made it quite clear that a prerequisite for a successful outcome of this work is that teachers get every support they need. The role of administration in all this should be further looked into. An investigation should also be made into the consequences of transforming the school departments with the county governor's offices into regional resource centres.

Mr Reijo Laukkanen in his speech described the co-operation between central and local administration. Central administration must evaluate and follow up developments in the municipalities in order that work on the national and the local level generally may proceed along parallel lines.

This would help to make the renewal of curricula more flexible. But before this is possible, the educational policies involved must be more clearly formulated.

Mr Esko Toivonen, representative of the Union of Rural Municipalities in Finland, in his speech emphasised that legislation also requires the municipalities actively to participate in the work of the development of their curricula. Innovation in this connection should be understood as a striving towards a system of continous up-dating. Teachers should be supported and encouraged in these endeavours. Innovation also requires time and money. The resources do exist, but they are often squandered on day-to-day routines. Now resources should be freed from routines and re-directed towards development. The municipalities should encourage goal-targeted management and the individual schools result-targeted management. The task of central administration is to relay information of decisions that have been made elsewhere. The central organisations of the municipalities should recommend to their members that in the future they draw up 4-year development plans for their schools.

Mr Aslak Lindström, representative of the Teachers' Trade Union, was of the opinion that work for the development of primary education will be successful only if the goals and the content harmonise with the means, possibilities and resources at the schools' disposal. To what extent school management and the teaching staff can be enthused for innovation is dependent on the general appreciation of the teacher's work and, also, to what extent school development is connected to general development in society at large. The role of the headmaster is central, but unless there is innovation of the educator himself, other reforms will not occur. Goal-targeted management is not as such suited to schools. The level of additional training should be raised and made more scientific. The share of the government in it should also be considerably increased. Teachers should have the opportunity to make themselves a carrier in pedagogics. In terms of educational content the Union wants the Ministry of Education and the National Board of General Education to initiate experimentation in integrated teaching in order to be able to revise teaching materials, curriculum and, ultimately, also legislation.

Mr Hannu Jokinen, researcher, in his opening speech pointed out that greater attention than at present should be given to the preparations of the innovation process. Important considerations are:

- understanding the target phenomenon,
- binding preparations to the school's own needs,
- verifying the skills of the teachers and others participating in the innovation process (for example the will to co-operate),
- utilising existing intellectual and material resources,
- securing continuous support for training and counselling,
- collecting and distributing experiences gained during the process and
- training of teachers for the implementation.

Various innovation strategies (for example course development, training team, school-based, cluster, consultancy and cascade approach) may be used in connection also with one and the same project.

Mr Petri Salo, Mr Leo Wahlroos and Mrs Kaija Vironmäki, all of them headmasters, gave individual accounts of the contents of various chapters in the final report and evaluations of their relevance to primary education in Finland. Professor Pirkko Anttila and Messrs Tapani Kananoja and Jarkko Weckström, chief inspectors in the National Board, reported on and analyised a total of nine case study reports. In their contributions, interesting points of view in evaluating the final report were put forward. The aim of the presentations and evaluations was to facilitate the ensuing group discussions.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from lectures, group evaluations of the final report and general discussion:

Steering of innovation process

Special tasks of central administration in promoting the innovation processes are the following:

- drawing up of education policies, that is planning the educational framework. The framework should be liberal, in order not to hamper innovation within individual schools. Licenced experimentation should be incorporated, making deviation from the revision of current legislation possible as well if need be.

- definition of the needs and the direction of development. This should be informational steering, pointing out various possibilities. National development projects are necessary and will be beneficial particularly if they are implemented in such a way that they will mainly collect and distribute information, and that their aim is educational, not supervising.

- acquisition and delegation of resources for the work.

- national co-operation of development activities. National co-ordination, among other things, means improved transmission of information and in part the centralised use of resources (for example certain materials are given national status, summaries will be of research reports published etc).

The task of the county governor's offices in innovation is to relay information between the municipalities and the individual schools and to support and assist the teachers. Activities could be focused, for instance, on the local resource centres for educational development. These centres should provide general counselling in innovation. Activities would partly consist in initiating national development project locally.

Forms of activity would be steering information, organising training and co-ordinating projects (collection and relay of information).

In Finland the municipalities are responsible for the development of school activities. Legislation gives the general guidelines for development. Openness in relaying information on national and local

development projects is considered of the greatest importance. Development projects should be steered by the municipalities and such clearly defined goals that cover longer periods of time should also be set up.

The headmaster of the school and the individual teacher play very important roles in innovation. The basic idea is that innovation should serve individual schools and the pupils attending that school. Defined in this way, innovation activities can make use of the existing courses of activity, without the need of altering legislation. The measures taken by various authorities and their assistance of the teachers should be such that they encourage teachers to try out new approaches in teaching, not kill their enthusiasm. When implementing various projects, participation in them should be optional and different solutions be accepted in the implementation.

Central areas of emphasis in the final report are interactive management, interactive evaluation and interactive learning. They describe the principles for developing modern school very well. They are suited as the basis of departure for development plans also beyond primary education in Finland.

The system of contact schools has rendered some very good international results. The possibilities of starting similar activities on a national level should be looked into. The contact schools could act as target schools in the research on teacher training.

School research

Our knowledge of the child's development should be better utilised in teaching and various teaching materials. A problem is the lack of collected research data. The collecting data should be continued and expanded. The National Board of General Education has decided to continue investigations of the concepts of learning and the knowledge that guide school instruction.

The choice of subject matter in school research was criticised. There was a general opinion that there was too much research into details of less importance. In order for research to be able to investigate issues that are important to the teachers, research projects should originate from the field, that is the teachers.

Teacher training

In addition to providing teacher candidates with the basic skills needed in work, teacher training should also give the candidates a sufficiently broad general education for evaluating international research material, planning innovational measures, improving co-operation, and understanding research reports, only to mention a few. Criticism is needed because the readers too often earlier required ready-made models for their instruction.

Teachers' in-service training should be wholly revised and made to serve innovation required from the teachers. It should start from the needs of the individual school and teachers, not from pre-conceived themes or contents.

Education and Teaching

The concept of equality should lead to the consideration of the individual talents of the pupil, which is also clearly stated in the Finnish School Act. The aims of education and teaching should be the same for everybody. The goals common to all pupils should be achieved by organising instruction according to the abilities of the pupil. However, one must accept that pupils differ in attaining the goals.

In order to develop measures for differentiation, the possibilities of temporal differentiation should be looked into. This means that pupils should be regrouped in a new way, disregarding the age group to which they traditionally belong.

Primary education should be developed into fully integrated instruction. This is possible by combining theory and reality, content and method, knowledge and skill, intellectual development and creative development, individualism and sociality, cognitive and emotional fostering. In the same way, barriers between instrumental and practical aesthetic subjects should be broken down.

Developing the faculty of thought is a very often neglected area in education. There has also been insufficient research so far into this area and teachers lack the skills to improve the situation. It was pointed out that the didactic structure of study materials in school do not encourage pupils to independent thinking. Another hinderance was the constant hurry in school work.

The development and renewal of grading along the guidelines put forward in the final report was considered urgent. This, however, entails changing attitudes to the pupil. It is also a matter of improving the teacher's skills of evaluating his own work. National directives dispensing with numerical grading should be prepared. Before this can be done, verbal grading should be introduced alongside with the traditional (numerical) grading.

It was generally noted that the participation of parents in school activities is being developed in all the participation countries in one form or another. It was considered important that alongside formal systems of participation, flexible modes of activity be developed for the promotion of co-operation between the school and pupils' homes. Teachers should receive guidance in the principles of this co-operation.

Utilisation of the final report in Finland

In his closing speech Mr Reijo Laukkanen was pleased to note that the analysis of the final report had disclosed points of contact with the work done for the development of primary education in Finland. The National Board of General Education considers important that information of the most important findings of the report be relayed at the teacher training courses organised by the universities and county governors' offices and that individual instances of work done elsewhere give rise to similar innovation projects that have been adapted to Finnish conditions.

The National Board of General Education and the Ministry of Education have decided to have part of the final report translated into Finnish, as soon as the final version of the report has been made available. The translation will be furnished with comments, tying the report to conditions prevailing in Finland.

In order that the utilisation of the thoughts expressed in the final report may be furthered also in the future, the National Board of General Education and the Ministry of Education will organise a second national follow-up seminar in 1990. At the seminar an evaluation will be made of the extent of the measures that have been taken.

A P P E N D I X 1

SEMINAR ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOWER LEVEL COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

Heinola Course Institute (Finland) 11-15 April 1988

Leader of the seminar: Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector

PROGRAMME

Monday 11 April	Chairman: Mr Yrjö Yrjönsuuri, Deputy Director General
07.00-08.30	Breakfast
08.00-11.10	Registration, accommodation, lunch
11.15-12.00	Opening lecture Primary education as part of the development of general education Mr Yrjö Yrjösuuri
12.00-12.30	CDCC Project No. 8 Innovation in Primary Education - a general presentation by Mr Jouko Könnölä, Counsellor of Education
12.30-14.15	Education co-operation within the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC): principles of co-operation, description of content, prospects Mr Maitland Stobart, Deputy Director of Education, Culture and Sport, Council of Europe
14.15-14.40	Coffee
14.40-15.30	Educational co-operation within the C.E. - lecture (cotinued) Mr Maitland Stobart
15.30-15.45	Presentation of seminar's programme Mr Reijo Laukkanen
14.45-16.00	Break
16.00-17.20	Characteristics of schools in Europe Mr Reijo Laukkanen
17.20-18.00	Dinner
Tuesday 12 April	Chairman: Mr Veikko Lepistö, Head of Department
07.30-10.30	Breakfast

08.30-11.10	Contact School Plan - presentation of content Dr. Dook Kopmels, Director of the Regional Pedagogic Centre Zeeland, Netherlands; member of the Working Group on the Contact School Plan set up by the CDCC's Project Group No. 8 on "Innovation in Primary Education"
11.10-12.15	Lunch
12.30-14.15	Today's trends in Europe and conclusions drawn from the Contact School Plan Dr. Dook Kopmels
14.15-14.40	Coffee
14.30-17.20	Steering of school development projects Dr. Dook Kopmels
17.20-18.00	Dinner
Wednesday 13 April	Chairman: Mr Jouko Könnölä, Counsellor of Education
07.30-08.30	Breakfast
08.30-11.10	Evaluation of the results of Project No. 8, comments contributed on the basis of reports on symposia, conferences, workshops, etc. (Steering and planning of innovation) Mr Jouko Könnölä, Counsellor of Education Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector Mr Hannu Jokinen, Researcher Mr Esko Toivonen, Assistant Head of Department Mr Aslak Lindström, Head of Department Discussion
11.10-12.15	Lunch
12.30-14.15	Evaluation of results of project: comments on conclusions and recommendations set out in Final Report Mr Petri Salo, Headmaster Mr Leo Wahlroos, Headmaster Mrs Kaija Vironmäki, Headmaster
14.15-14.40	Coffee
14.45-17.20	Evaluation of Project No. 8 - working groups Chairman: Group No. 1: Mr Antti Kettunen, Municipal School Director 2: Mr Hannu Lilja, Director of Education 3: Mrs Riitta-Liisa Korkeamäki, Lecturer 4: Mrs Maila Rättyä, Headmaster 5: Mr Leo Wahlroos, Headmaster 6: Mr Jarkko Weckström, Chief Inspector
17.20-18.00	Dinner
18.00-	Evaluation of Project No. 8 - working groups (continued)

Thursday 14 April	Chairman: Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector
07.30-08.30	Breakfast
08.00-10.00	Comments on Project No. 8 contributes on the basis seminar report and case study reports Mrs Pirkko Anttila, Professor Mr Tapani Kananoja, Chief Inspector Mr Jarkko Weckström, Chief Inspector
10.00-11.10	Evaluation of Project No. 8 - working groups as above
11.10-12.15	Lunch
12.30-14.15	Evaluation in working groups (continued)
14.15-14.40	Coffee
14.30-17.20	Presentation of group reports
17.20-18.00	Dinner
Friday 15 April	Chairman: Mr Yrjö Yrjönsuuri, Deputy Director General
07.30-08.30	Breakfast
08.30-10.15	Development of teaching and fostering in lower level of comprehensive school (primary education): summing up of seminar and discussions Mr Yrjö Yrjönsuuri, Deputy Director General Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector Dr. Karik Uusikylä, Assistant professor
10.30-11.15	How to respond to the new challenges made by learning and current international trends Dr. Erno Lehtinen, Senior Lecturer
11.15-12.00	Lunch
12.00-13.25	How to respond to new challenges ... (continued)
13.25-13.40	Closing speech Mr Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector
13.40-14.15	Coffee

APPENDIX 2

List of Participants

Teacher training colleges and schools

Mr. Heikki Kyyrö, Senior master
Rykmentintie 43
20880 TURKU

Mrs. Sinikka Lindgren, Senior master
Erottajankatu 12
13130 HÄMEENLINNA

Mrs. Päivi Pitkänen, Senior master
Jyväskylän OKL
Seminaarinkatu 15
40100 JYVÄSKYLÄ

Dr. Kari Uusikylä, Assistant professor
Maistraatinkatu 4 B 13
00240 HELSINKI

Mrs. Anita Ödman, Senior master
Batteriuddsvägen 1
65350 VASA 35

Mrs. Riitta Harikoski, Senior master
Steniuksentie 22 A 4
00320 HELSINKI

Mrs. Paula Häkkä, Senior master
Hämeenlinnan normaalikoulu
Seminaarinkatu 2
13130 HÄMEENLINNA

Mr. Hannu Juuso, Senior class master
Humanistintie 2
90570 OULU

Mr. Seppo Kanervisto, Senior class master
Talikkokatu 8 C 43
20540 TURKU

Mrs. Riitta-Liisa Korkeamäki, Senior master
Oulunseläntie 22 D
90580 OULU

Mrs. Maila Rättyä, Headmaster
Kajaanin normaalikoulu
PL 51
87101 KAJAANI

Mr. Petri Salo, Headmaster
Savonlinnan normaalikoulu
Kuninkaankartanonkatu 5
57100 SAVONLINNA

Mr. Perttu Leinonen,
Senior master
Jyväskylän normaalikoulu
Seminaarinkatu 15
40100 JYVÄSKYLÄ

Mrs. Eija-Liisa Sokka-Meaney,
Senior master
Joensuun normaalikoulu
PL 111
80101 JOENSUU

Provincial Adminstrative Boards

Mrs. Kaija Aalto, Planner
Provincial Adminstration Board of Mikkeli
PL 50-51
50101 MIKKELI

Mr. Alvar Karvinen, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Uusimaa
Ratapihantie 9
00520 HELSINKI

Mr. Unto Lappalainen, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Keski-Suomi
Hannikaisenkatu 7
40100 JYVÄSKYLÄ

Mr. Eino Mäkelä, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Mikkeli
PL 50-51
50101 MIKKELI

Mr. Jorma Riikonen, Educational Advisor
Provincial Adminstration Board of Häme
37860 KÄRJENNIEMI

Mrs. Aila Rintamäki, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Lapland
PL 8002
96101 ROVANIEMI

Mrs. Helena Seppälä, Planner
Provincial Adminstration Board of Oulu
Linnankatu 3
90100 OULU

Mr. Erkki Annala, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Turku and Pori
PL 21
20801 TURKU

Mrs. Ritva-Sini Härkönen, Project Officer
Provincial Adminstration Board of Kymi
PL 301
45101 KOUVOLA

Mr. Esa Huttunen, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Kuopio
Sepänkatu 2 A
70100 KUOPIO

Mr. Pauli Rautama, School Inspector
Provincial Adminstration Board of Vaasa
PL 200
65101 VAASA

Mr. Göran Holm, Educational Advisor
66600 VÖYRI

Local School Boards

Mr. Martti Hölsä, Chief Educational Officer
Kouluvirasto
Kyläkaivontie 14
01350 VANTAA

Mr. Hannu Lilja, Director of Education
Kouluvirasto
Vaasanpuistikko 16
65100 VAASA

Mr. Harri Valtasola, Class teacher
Linnala School
Lukiolaisenkuja 2
55120 IMATRA

Mr. Raimo Forström, Chief Educational Officer
PL 98
28101 PORI

Mr. Antti Kettunen, Chief Educational Officer
Puistokatu 35
40200 JYVÄSKYLÄ

Mr. Paavo Puumala, Chief Educational Officer
59600 KAUSTINEN

Mr. Leo Wahlroos, Headmaster
Linnala School
Lukiolaisenkatu 2
55120 IMATRA -

Mrs. Kaija Vironmäki, Headmaster
Puutarhakatu 1
00100 HELSINKI

Lecturers and other participants

Mrs. Inkeri Aarnio, Secretary for Cultural Affairs,
Ministry of Education
Meritullinkatu 10
00170 HELSINKI

Dr. Pirkko Anttila, Acting Professor,
University of Helsinki
Bulevardinkatu 18
00120 HELSINKI

Mr. Hannu Jokinen, Research Officer
Research Institute of Faculty of Pedagogies,
University of Jyväskylä
Seminaarinkatu 15
40100 JYVÄSKYLÄ

Mr. Karl-Gustav Jossfolk, Chief Inspector,
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI

Mrs. Kaija Jylhä, Chief Inspector

Mrs. Maija-Liisa Jääskeläinen, Class Teacher
Teachers Trade Union in Finland

Mr. Tapani Kananoja, Chief Inspector
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI

Dr. Dook Kopmels, Director of the Regional Pedagogic
Centre "Zeeland",
Noorway 495
4333 BR ST. LAURENS
NETHERLANDS

Mrs. Eira Korpinen, Special Research Officer
Research Institute of Faculty of Pedagogies,
University of Jyväskylä
Seminaarinkatu 15
40100 JYVÄSKYLÄ

Mr. Jouko Könnölä, Counsellor of Education
Ministry of Education
Meritullinkatu 10
00170 HELSINKI

Mr. Reijo Laukkanen, Chief Inspector
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI

Mr. Esko Laulajainen, Chief Inspector
Ministry of Education, University of Helsinki.
Meritullinkatu 2
00170 HELSINKI

Mr. Veikko Lepistö, Head of Department
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI

Mr. Aslak Lindström, Head of Department
Teachers Trade Union in Finland
Rautatieläisenkatu 6
00520 HELSINKI

Mr. Jaakko Linnankivi, Chief Inspector
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI

Mrs. Sinikka Lipsanen, Planner
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI

Mr. Esko Piippo, Headmaster, Kajaani

Mr. Maitland Stobart, Deputy Director of Education,
Culture and Sport
Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Mr. Esko Toivonen, Assistant Head of Department
Union of Rural, Minucipolitiks in Finland
PL 200
00101 HELSINKI

Mr. Jarkko Weckström, Chief Inspector

Mr. Yrjö Yrjönsuuri, Deparety Director General
National Board of General Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
00530 HELSINKI